



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/690,928	10/22/2003	Dong-Ho Han	P16829	6901
28062 7590 12/14/2007 BUCKLEY, MASCHOFF & TALWALKAR LLC 50 LOCUST AVENUE NEW CANAAN, CT 06840			EXAMINER LE, THAO X	
			ART UNIT 2814	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/14/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10690928	10/22/03	HAN ET AL.	P16829

BUCKLEY, MASCHOFF & TALWALKAR LLC
50 LOCUST AVENUE
NEW CANAAN, CT 06840

EXAMINER

Thao X. Le

ART UNIT	PAPER
2814	20071210

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Attached please find the approved the reply brief noted.

/Thao X Le/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2814

DETAILED ACTION

Essentially, the Appellant's reply brief suggests that

a. The teachings of Behling in regard to over voltage protection or of Brandt in regard to maximizing capacitance in a capacitor have no application to the pair of signal traces included in the structure disclosed in Asai. Thus, teachings of the secondary references--Behling and Brandt—have no bearing on the structure disclosed in the primary reference. The Examiner respectfully agrees, and furthermore the rejection does not rely on the structure of Behling and Brandt, but rather using a high dielectric constant teaching for obviousness rejection. The Appellant argues against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. Thus, the Appellant fails to prove that using the high dielectric material teaching of Behling and Brandt would destroy the intended purpose of Asai's invention.

b. No motivation to combine: The Examiner respectfully disagrees because it is not necessary in order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness it is not necessary that the prior art suggest the combination to achieve the same advantage or results discovered by applicant.

c. With respect to KSR, the Examiner submits that using high dielectric material between two conductor to create a high capacitance capacitor is well known in the art; thus, the combination of Asai with Behling and/or Brandt would


Art Unit: 2814

read on the claimed limitation and that would be proper within 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

obviousness rejection.

/Thao X Le/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2814



RICHARD K. SEIDEL
DIRECTOR
TECHNOLOGY CENTER